UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No.	CR 18	-0041	JD	
Plaintiff,)))			ER EXCLU SPEEDY T	DING L	ED
v. William Ye	3n,				FEB 14	2018
Defendant.)	*	2	,	SUSAN Y. S CLERK, U.S. DIST	SOONG RICT COURT
For the reason stated by the partial Act from Felomany 14, continuance outweigh the bes 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court main	2018, to March 14, 2 t interest of the public	208, and the de	finds that t fendant in a	the ends of j	justice serve al. <i>See</i> 18 U.	d by the S.C. §
	ant a continuance would. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(I).	ıld be likely	to result in	a miscarria	age of justice	>.
defendants, to or law, that is	o unusual or so complete nature of the proset is unreasonable to exthe time limits establi	cution, or t	he existence ate prepara	e of novel q tion for pre	uestions of f trial proceed	act ings or the trial
	ant a continuance wou becount the exercise of					
counsel's oth	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).					
necessary for	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).					
	ns stated on the record vaived with the conse					· ·
	ns stated on the record (F) for delay resulting					
IT IS SO ORDERED.				1	4	
DATED: 2/14/18	1.00	7	and	hs N	estro	4
			ndis A. W			
	7	Ur	nted States	Magistrate	Judge	

Assistant United States Attorney

STIPULATED:

Attorney for Defendant